

COMMENTS

by E.D. Cook

(The University of Calgary)

Chang: *A generative study of discourse in Korean.* In the literature available on Korean grammar we do not have any comprehensive treatment of connectives, nor does one find any reasonable account of complex and compound sentences. For this reason, among others, I am particularly pleased to see Professor Chang's paper. I believe he has made good headway in the right direction and I hope to see more of his work in this area.

Since Professor Chang intended to present a general account of the problems involved, in his paper, I shall not make any specific comments. I will also offer some general observations.

The main concern of his paper, in my opinion, is the constraints which govern two simplex sentences which are connected by a connective. For example, Professor Chang observes that the verbs of two simplex sentences connected by *ko* (*se*) are both nonstative verbs, and that the verb phrases of both simplex sentences must have the same tense marker, where the tense marker of the first simplex sentence deletes. Later on, he observes that both simplex sentences must be in the same sentence types, i.e. declarative, imperative, propositive etc. What I would like to see is that somehow these constraints are ordered hierarchically, i.e. perhaps certain constraint is applicable to all conjoined constructions, while others apply to specific constructions. For example, the constraint that 'two simplex sentences should be in the same sentence type' might apply to a number of conjoined constructions other than just the ones which are connected by the connective *ko* or *kose*. This observation, I offer not as a criticism, but as a suggestion which will make the generalizations more general. Similarly, the tense deletion may be governed by a more general principle, universal or language-specific. In fact there is no satisfactory account of this phenomenon even in English which has been studied more intensively. For example, what is the underlying tense of the embedded sentence in:

I want *to go*.

I wanted *to go*.

No one would dispute the fact that the phrase *to go* in both sentences comes from an

underlying sentence. But what is the tense of the embedded sentence?

Kim: *Gravity in Korean Phonology*. I am sure all of you enjoyed this paper as much as I did. Perhaps it would be useful to sum up what this paper has accomplished.

First of all, the principle of close articulation and the principle of gravity together offer an explanation for the seven phonological facts which appear unrelated. What more can we expect than the beauty of a generalization which provides functional relationships between a number of seemingly isolated events? Secondly, these two principles, one on the horizontal plane, another on the vertical plane, provide for physical and physiological bases for the phonological system. In the past, there has been a tendency especially among structural linguists to explain phonological systems purely on the grounds of abstract relationships, which is sometimes too far removed from articulatory bases. Thirdly, these two principles offer explanations both for synchronic and diachronic processes. Following Saussurian tradition, linguists often neglected to relate the two processes even where the relationship is apparent, although some linguists offered an occasional 'panchronic' view.

There is not much that I can add to the essence of this paper. But a couple of comments on umlaut and palatalization might help. The depalatalization shown in the word *kimchi* is very interesting. Another example I occasionally hear is *kyemsim* for *cemsim* 'lunch', which is a case of hypercorrection and depalatalization. What puzzles me most, however, is that there are a number of examples where umlaut is allowed across an intervening liquid. As pointed out in the paper, *sol* 'sound' does not become *soyli*, but *noli* 'to stare' becomes *noyli*, *pel* 'to throw away' becomes *peyli*, *tel* 'to take along' becomes *teyli*, etc. It may very well be the case that the surface liquid originates from two different sources. What is more interesting is that double consonant base verbs involving a liquid constitute counterexamples also to the principle of close articulation. I am quite convinced that research into this area will reveal very interesting facts of morphology and phonology.

Exceptions to the palatalization are more numerous than what is suggested in the paper. Perhaps it may be a rule rather than an exception. That is, in my own native dialect almost all initial *k* and *h* of native words have become palatalized before *i*. For example, the surname *kim* alternates with *cim*, *kim* 'weeds' with *cim*, *kin* 'long' with *cin*, *kilum* 'oil' with *cilum*, *kilsam* 'textile work' with *cilsam*, *kyewu* 'barely' with *ceyu*, *kiwulta* 'to be slanted' with *ciwulta*, *kēycip* 'woman' with *cicip*, etc.; *hyung* 'faults' with *swung*, *hyungakhan* 'wicked' with *swungakhan*, *hyōca* 'dutiful son' with *sōca*, *hyektay* 'belt' with *sektay*, *hyuci* 'wastepaper' with *swuci*, etc.

In the presence of these examples, it would be difficult to maintain that palatalization of peripheral sounds (*k*, *h*) is an exception rather than a rule.

Sohn: *Coherence in Korean 'Auxiliary' Verb Constructions.* I am particularly interested in the two sets of observations, one on syntactic constraints and one on semantic relationships. Professor Sohn has presented these observations in order to specify syntactic and semantic properties of the so-called 'auxiliary constructions' without making any strong claims about certain 'universal hypothesis'.

Several doctoral dissertations have been written by Korean students of linguistics on Korean syntax. Unfortunately, however, not all of them have made any significant contribution to the understanding of Korean syntax, much less to the understanding of certain linguistic universals they claim to have discovered in Korean syntax.

What we need most urgently now is to bring in all relevant information based on data like those that have been presented by Professor Sohn this morning rather than to manipulate Korean in order to ascertain a certain theoretical claim which happens to be fashionable at a particular time.

Since the inception of generative principles in linguistic theory, many students of linguistics have forgotten a lesson which the structuralist had to teach for a time. Although one does not believe literally what is said in the motto: "Describe the language in its own terms", it would be to his own disadvantage should he neglect to look into the other side of the coin.

Finally, I might add that Professor Sohn's observations presented to us today are particularly welcome as they provide grounds for reconciliation between the two opposing views, the syntactically oriented and the semantically oriented.

Song: *Some negative remarks on negation in Korean.* Here is a forceful and convincing argument for the defense of the theory of negation in Korean which Professor Song originally developed in his dissertation some half a dozen years ago. I would be very much interested to know how the two critics would defend their claims in the face of the data presented in this paper.

The argument that sentences which are 'synonymous' must be represented by the same deep structure is difficult to maintain unless, as Professor Song has correctly pointed out, it is clearly defined what is meant by "synonymous". Furthermore, it has never been clear to me whether they make clear distinction between what I call (i) a weak claim in which they believe sentences that have the same deep syntactic structure must have the same

meaning and (ii) a strong claim in which they believe all sentences which have the same meaning(whatever that means) must be represented by the same deep structure. There has been ample evidence to substantiate the weak claim, but the same cannot be said of the strong claim. It may be the case that the two types of negative constructions under discussion do in fact have the same meaning and that the synonymy can somehow be proven. But this does not by itself rule out the possibility that they do have two distinct syntactic structures. Indeed, it has been well demonstrated by Professor Song, that the two types of negative constructions are syntactically different in that only one of them is subject to the nominalization process.

Professor Song's theory of negation in Korean is a sort of a classic in the tradition of generative studies in Korean. There certainly is room for improvement. But one could benefit a great deal from a careful study of this theory, and I hope younger students of Korean linguistics will not make the same mistakes as some have.